



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,492	03/18/2005	Willem Jonker	NL 030283	5040
24737 7590 05/29/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
SCHWARTZ, DARREN B				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2135				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/29/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/528,492

Applicant(s)

JONKER ET AL.

Examiner

DARREN SCHWARTZ

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2, 8, 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pasieka (WO 00/21241), hereinafter referred to as Pasieka.

Re claims 1, 8 and 15: Pasieka teaches a method for secure content distribution among devices (101-105) in a network (110) (Abstract, lines 1-3; page 4, lines 9-10), the method comprising the steps of:

registering, by means of a central device (101) administrating the network, a device (102-105) entering the network (110) and issuing at least one certificate to the entering device (102-105) (Figs 5, 6 or 7; page 4, lines 1-6); and

distributing content among devices (101-105) in the network (110) based on authentication by means of the at least one certificate issued to each device (102-105) (entire Abstract), wherein the distribution of content from a first device (101-105) to a second device (101-105) is enabled by the first device authenticating the second device by means of the at least one certificate of the second device and the second device authenticating the first device by means of the at least one certificate of the first device (page 3, lines 3-8; page 7, line 22 – page 8, line 2).

Re claims 2 and 9: Pasieka teaches the at least one certificate comprises: a first certificate comprising a public key generated by the central device (101) and a signature created with a device

private key (page 1, lines 16-25); and a second certificate comprising a public key of the entering device (102-105) and a signature created with a private key generated by the central device (101), said private key generated by the central device (101) corresponding to said public key generated by the central device (101) (page 1, lines 16-25; page 2, lines 3-10; page 5, lines 5-24).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3, 4, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pasioka (WO 00/21241), hereinafter referred to as Pasioka, as applied to claims 1, 2, 8 and 9, in view of Lee et al (U.S. Pat 6950941 B1), hereinafter referred to as Lee.

Re claims 3 and 10: Pasioka teaches all the limitations of claims 1 and 8 as previously discussed.

However, Lee teaches verifying a third certificate with a device public key stored in each device (101-105), the third certificate signed with a certificate authority private key, wherein verification is performed by means of a corresponding certificate authority public key (Fig 2: lines 49-51; col 8, lines 28-39);

authenticating, by means of said device public key, a device (101-105) storing a device private key, said device private key corresponding to said device public key (col 8, lines 40-42).

the third certificate being factory installed (col 8, lines 36-39)

Re claims 4 and 11: Pasioka teaches the step of distributing content among devices (101-105) in the network (110) comprises:

sending the second certificate of the first device (101- 105) from the first device to the second device (101-105) and the second certificate of the second device from the second device to the first device; verifying, using the public key generated by the central device (101), the second certificate of the second device (101-105) at the first device (101-105) and the second certificate of the first device at the second device (Pasioka: page 3, lines 3-8; page 7, line 22 – page 8, line 2);

sending the first certificate of the first device from the first device (101-105) to the second device (101-105) and the first certificate of the second device from the second device to the first device (Pasioka: page 3, lines 3-8; page 7, line 22 – page 8, line 2);

verifying, using the device public key, the first certificate of the second device (101-105) at the first device (101-105) and the first certificate of the first device at the second device (Pasioka: page 3, lines 3-8; page 7, line 22 – page 8, line 2);

However, Lee teaches:

sending a third certificate of the central device (101), the third certificate being factory installed and signed with a certificate authority private key, from the first device to the second device (101-105) and sending the third certificate of the central device (101) of the second device to the first device (Lee: Fig 2: lines 49-51; col 8, lines 28-39);

verifying, using the certificate authority public key, the third certificate at the second device (101-105) and at the first device (101-105) (Lee: col 8, lines 40-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Pasioka with the teachings of Lee, for the purpose of

providing robust device-to-device authentication and device-server authentication; providing both forms of authentication is well known in the art of ad-hoc networks.

5. Claims 5, 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pasioka (WO 00/21241), hereinafter referred to as Pasioka, as applied to claims 1, 8 and 15, in view of Mäki et al, "Robust Membership Management for Ad-hoc Groups," hereinafter referred to as Mäki, in further view of Segal (U.S. Pat 6347338 B1), hereinafter referred to as Segal.

Re claims 5, 12 and 16: Pasioka teaches all the limitations of claims 1, 8 and 15 as previously discussed and further teaches registering entities contained in the network (110) (Figs 5, 6 or 7; page 4, lines 1-6).

However, Mäki teaches issuing a list of deregistered devices in the network (110) to all non-deregistered devices in said network (section 3.3 entitled "Protection against the compromise of keys," subsection "Membership revocation," ¶1-2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Pasioka with the teachings of Mäki for the purpose of providing information about nodes that have left the network and/or have been compromised. Such transmittals of CRL and membership lists are well known in ad-hoc network structures.

The combination of Pasioka and Mäki are silent as to storing lists of the entities contained in the network (110).

However, Segal teaches storing lists of the entities contained in the network (110) (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Pasioka and Mäki with the teachings of Segal for the purpose of providing nodes as to the status of respective memberships.

6. Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pasioka (WO 00/21241), hereinafter referred to as Pasioka, as applied to claims 1, 8 and 15, in view of Mäki et al, "Robust Membership Management for Ad-hoc Groups," hereinafter referred to as Mäki.

Re claims 6, 7, 13 and 14: Pasioka teaches all the limitations of claims 1 and 8 as previously discussed.

However, Mäki teaches the network is an authorized domain (Section: "Introduction," ¶1, lines 4-6) or the network is a home network (Section: "Introduction," ¶1, lines 4-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Pasioka with the teachings of Mäki for the purpose of providing a large network security structure into a user's local LAN or home network.

Re claims 17 and 18: Pasioka teaches all the limitations of claim 15 as previously discussed.

However, Mäki teaches the central device (Section 3 entitled "Managing group Membership with Certificates," ¶1) is administrating an authorized domain (Section: "Introduction," ¶1, lines 4-6) and the central device (Section 3 entitled "Managing group Membership with Certificates," ¶1) is administrating a home network (Section: "Introduction," ¶1, lines 4-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Pasioka with the teachings of Mäki for the purpose of

providing a large network security structure into a user's local LAN or home network and providing a semi-hierarchical structure to the local network.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat 6671803 B1 discloses all that is contained in WO 00/21241.

U.S. Pat 5949877 A teaches CRL's and certificate validation.

U.S. Pat Pub 2003/0188156 A1 teaches many aspects relevant to applicant's disclosure

U.S. Pat Pub 2003/0174838 A1 teaches device certificates and a DRM system.

Pestoni, Florian. "xCP Cluster Protocol." IBM Presentation to Copy Protection Technical Working Group, IBM Research, 18 July 2002.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DARREN SCHWARTZ whose telephone number is (571)270-3850. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571)272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2135

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. S./

Examiner, Art Unit 2135

/KIMYEN VU/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2135